

VZCZCXYZ0000  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0280/01 0851506  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
O 251506Z MAR 08  
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1268  
INFO RUEHGB/AMEMBASSY BAGHDAD PRIORITY 0106  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L THE HAGUE 000280

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE  
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,  
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>  
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC  
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS)  
NSC FOR SMITH  
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: DECL: 03/25/2018  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)  
SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP UP FOR  
WEEK ENDING MARCH 21, 2008

REF: A) THE HAGUE 264 B) 2007 AMMAN 4578

Classified By: Deputy Permanent Representative Janet E. Beik for reason  
s 1.4 (b) and (d)

This is CWC-13-08.

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

1. (SBU) Preparations for the Second Review Conference (RevCon) continued, with much of the work behind the scenes. The UK chair of the RevCon working group is revising the draft report and proposed informal daily meetings beginning March 28 to discuss the text. The March 18 meeting of Permanent-Five (P-5) ambassadors was uncharacteristically frank in discussing how to deal with the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). (Del note: although the OPCW is not a UN organization, many of the UN groups, both formal and informal, are active here.) The U.S. delegation also met with the PAO and OPCW public relations director, the Lithuanian ambassador, and the Indian delegation to discuss RevCon issues. The OPCW's Host Country Committee met with the municipality of The Hague on parking.

2. (SBU) Teams of U.S. and UK representatives met with the Technical Secretariat (TS) March 19-20 to go through the Iraqi draft declaration for a final set of recommendations to the Iraqi government. There was no news on when Iraq will accede to the convention, but the TS believes it will likely happen before or during the Review Conference next month.

-----  
P-5 MEETING  
-----

3. (SBU) Russian Ambassador Gevorgian hosted a meeting of the P-5 ambassadors on March 18 to discuss

universality (the traditional topic for these periodic meetings) and the Review Conference. The group agreed to encourage the countries close to accession (Lebanon, Iraq, Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Guinea Bissau) but did not see any immediate action with regard to the other countries remaining outside the convention. Although the French had planned to host a seminar on universality focusing on the Middle East during their EU presidency (July - December 2008), they have decided that the time is not yet right.

14. (SBU) British Ambassador Parker, chair of the RevCon working group, outlined four issues specifically of concern to the P-5: ensuring a balanced, neutral text on universality; including reference to UN Security Council resolution 1540 and the OPCW's contributions to international counter-terrorism and non-proliferation efforts; strengthening national implementation; and maintaining an appropriate role for the OPC in international cooperation. Ambassador Javits underscored that we want an outcome as strong or stronger than the first Review Conference, and the group agreed. French Ambassador Gausson noted the Paris Seminar on March 25-26 would focus on non-proliferation and terrorism.

15. (C) In an unusually candid discussion of the Non-Aligned movement, Amb. Gevorgian offered a personal analysis that opposition to the inclusion of terrorism on the RevCon agenda likely stemmed from developing countries' general objection to the Security Council resolution enforcing legal

obligations, even on non-states parties to the convention. Chinese Ambassador Xue agreed, noting that many countries do not want the Security Council -- or the P-5 -- dominating other organizations. She felt a lower profile and "statesmanship" could lead to a reasonable discussion of the terrorism issue and urged her colleagues to focus on the practical aspects of Resolution 1540.

16. (C) Amb. Gevorgian noted the NAM role has created two camps heading into the RevCon, with the NAM emphasizing destruction and others non-proliferation. Amb. Xue commented that the NAM is actually quite weak here; many countries are not present and most are not knowledgeable about the issues. She said an important role that the small group of activist NAM leaders plays is to bring in the smaller countries and make them feel part of the group. China observes the NAM meetings and will work to achieve balance between destruction and non-proliferation, with a broader goal of maintaining balance among all "four pillars" of the convention. The ambassadors all agreed that north-south polarization of the Conference must be avoided.

-----  
PLANNING FOR PRESS AT THE REVIEW CONFERENCE  
-----

17. (SBU) On March 18, Del reps met with Jim Foster (PAO) and Astrid Bharos (Senior Press Assistant) of the Embassy's Public Diplomacy Office. Subsequently, Amb. Javits and Del reps met with Michael Luhan (Head, OPCW Media and Public Affairs). In these meetings, Del reps briefed Foster and Bharos on the RevCon and enlisted their support for handling any RevCon-related press inquiries. Luhan gave an update on his press plan for the RevCon, including a press conference by the Director General and an early substantive wire service story. He is working on compiling "visuals" -- both photos and film footage that can be used with CWC stories, and he appreciated U.S. film from the Defense Department. He inquired

about possible press availability by visiting senior U.S. delegation members.

¶8. (SBU) Luhan said that the TS is preparing for Iraqi accession before or during the RevCon. He noted his view that, from a PR perspective, Iraqi accession will be positive in raising the profile of the OPCW.

-----  
WEOG and OEWG: REVIEW CONFERENCE PREPARATION  
-----

¶9. (SBU) The Western European and Others Group (WEOG) met on March 18. UK delegate outlined the chairman's plans for a revised consolidated text to be transmitted to the TS for translation and distribution by the end of the week, and the next working group discussion of process. The chair would be proposing daily informal meetings beginning March 28 to go through the revised text in four or five sections, with afternoons left open to allow smaller drafting groups to meet as they wished. Any agreed changes to the text would go into the final draft for distribution at the beginning of the conference. In the ensuing discussion, WEOG members were skeptical that much would be agreed before the RevCon, but agreed that the negotiation process was important for better understanding of the views of delegations and gauging the amount of support for NAM positions.

¶10. (U) On March 19, Amb. Parker (UK) chaired a meeting of the Open Ended Working Group (OWEG) with

discussion focusing on next steps until the opening of the Review Conference. He outlined the decisions needed on April 3 at the last OEWG meeting on both attendance by non-signatories, international organizations, NGOs and industry; and nominations for officers of the Conference (chairman, 2 vice chairs from each regional group, the Committee of the Whole to be chaired by the African group, and the Credentials Committee to be chaired by WEOG).

¶11. (U) Despite objections from Cuba, South Africa, Iran and India, Amb. Parker stated that he would send a revised chairman's draft of the report to the TS by the end of the week for distribution to all States Parties before the RevCon. There was extensive discussion on whether and how other papers, including the NAM comments on the February 22 draft, might be distributed, with NAM members insisting on official distribution of their paper, and other delegations arguing against selective distribution of only some states' views. The German Ambassador suggested that the cover note to the chairman's draft text could refer to other documents available on the OPCW external server, an idea which drew broad support.

¶12. (U) The OEWG will meet again on March 27 to discuss initial views of the revised text and will begin daily informal meetings March 28. Amb. Javits urged that the informal meetings be open, transparent, and elect their own chairs, but that they use the limited remaining time productively.

-----  
BILATERALS ON THE REVIEW CONFERENCE  
-----

¶13. (SBU) Lithuanian Ambassador Verba called on Amb. Javits on March 20 to discuss a national initiative for the RevCon. Del reps sat in. Amb. Verba presented a working paper by his government on the promotion of voluntary international cooperation on chemical weapons dumped at sea. He is consulting other EU members on the issue and has drafted a paragraph for inclusion in the EU's joint RevCon

statement. The U.S. is the first non-EU country with whom he has broached the issue. Amb. Javits acknowledged the seriousness of the problem in the Baltic Sea and noted that individual countries' expertise is often far greater than the OPCW's, particularly with regard to the ecological implications. Del reps outlined key U.S. objectives for the RevCon and encouraged Lithuania's active engagement.

¶14. (SBU) Later on March 20, Indian Ambassador Sabharwal and her deputy, Riva Das, called on Amb. Javits and Del reps. Amb. Sabharwal was particularly concerned that there will not be sufficient time to address all the issues after "yet another draft text" and inquired about how the Conference would organize itself. Amb. Javits noted that the organization during the Conference would be up to the Chairman, but that it might be helpful to the Saudi Ambassador if a small group of interested ambassadors would like to discuss organization and time management with him. He emphasized that the NAM should not push for constant caucuses during the Conference, that regional or other groups could meet outside of the formal schedule. He also advised that states friendly to Iran (like India) should warn the Iranian ambassador that delaying everything until the end is unlikely to succeed this time. The report, Amb. Javits said, should be inspirational as well as a road map for the work ahead. Amb. Sabharwal responded that the CWC has achieved a lot, and that should be reflected in the RevCon report. She agreed to keep in touch with Amb. Javits as things progress.

-----  
IRAQI DRAFT DECLARATION  
-----

¶15. (C) On March 6, the Director-General of the OPCW received a copy of Iraq's "final draft" CWC declaration, which was passed to the TS for review prior to Iraq's official submission of its declaration to the OPCW, as agreed during the workshop last October in Amman (Ref B). The TS convened a working meeting with the U.S. and UK on March 19 and 20 to review the latest draft and provide a final set of comments to Iraq. Participants included: Clive Rowland, Jim McGilly, Chris McCormick, and Lee Littman for the UK; Horst Reeps, Oleg Ukarov, Ken Penman, and Chris Carrow for the TS; and Tom Ferguson, Don Clagett, Bill Parker, and Abby Robinson for the U.S. The final set of recommendations and suggested specific changes are being transmitted (via CD) by the Director General to Baghdad through the Iraqi Embassy in The Hague.

¶16. (C) The Iraqis followed earlier U.S. suggestions to classify two potentially sensitive sections of the declaration as OPCW Highly Protected: the new Annex on the contents of the Al-Muthanna bunkers in order to mitigate possible terrorists' interest; and the Declaration Forms for Past Receipts of CW in order to minimize politicizing States Parties' historical activities.

¶17. (C) Although Iraqi representatives have stated that their CWC accession could come at any time, Horst Reeps said the TS has no additional information on their accession other than rumors that Iraq will accede before the RevCon. UK representatives also voiced concern from policy makers on an accession date.

-----  
BILATERAL DISCUSSIONS WITH THE UK TEAM  
-----

¶18. (C) The U.S. held bilateral discussions with the UK representatives on the margins of the meetings with the TS on both Iraq and Libya. One of the issues discussed was the suggested addition of Iraq's ricin production and weaponization for field testing purposes, which, although reported by the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) in July 2007, was not included in Iraq's draft declaration. The UK representatives stated that they were not prepared to address the Iraqi ricin/toxins issue with the TS since the UK had not completed its internal assessment on the research and production of these toxins. Thus, the U.S. reps did not raise the ricin issue and agreed to coordinate with the UK on this issue within the next few weeks.

¶19. (C) The UK questioned Iraqi preparation for and ability to respond to Member States' questions about its CWC declaration in future bilateral Article IX consultations. U.S. del suggested that, without adequate preparation, the Iraqis might be limited to deferring official responses to Baghdad, and agreed that US-UK-Iraqi coordination is needed in anticipation of these interactions.

¶20. (C) On Libya, the UK is interested in an agreed way ahead for the U.S. and UK to reengage Libya on the Rabta conversion. The UK expressed interest in trying to reschedule a trip to Tripoli on the status of the conversion as well as CW destruction and the

remaining CW issues from the Trilateral Steering and Cooperation Committee (TSCC). The UK does not see Libya's proposed removal of the Rabta sandbag wall as an issue of concern. Both delegations agreed to consult with capitals about a proposed schedule and agenda.

-----  
HOST COUNTRY COMMITTEE  
-----

¶21. (U) On March 19, Amb. Javits and Del rep attended a meeting of the OPCW Host Country Committee with representatives of the Municipality of The Hague. Discussion focused primarily on the issue of parking. The Deputy Mayor of The Hague noted that the municipality, in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, designates reserved parking spaces in front of diplomatic missions and official residences. However, as there is no legal basis in Dutch law for reserving on-street parking spaces, the reserved spaces are merely a courtesy and cannot be enforced.

¶22. (U) Beik sends.

Gallagher